



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/996,475	11/20/2001	Vladislav Olchanski	58367.000003	2706

7590 06/20/2006

Thomas E. Anderson, Esq.
Hunton & Williams
1900 K Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20006-1109

EXAMINER

TANG, KAREN C

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2151

DATE MAILED: 06/20/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/996,475	Applicant(s) OLCHANSKI ET AL.	
	Examiner Karen C. Tang	Art Unit 2151	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 May 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-25 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-25 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

- A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 5/1/06 has been entered.
- Claims 1-25 are presented for further examination.

Response to Arguments

1. Claims 1-25 have been examined.
2. Applicant's arguments filed 05/01/06 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.
3. The affidavit filed on 03/15/06 under 37 CFR 1.131 has been considered but is ineffective to overcome the Menzie et al. reference.
4. Applicant is attempt to prove the invention by showing conception before May 15, 2000 (the effective date of Menzie) before that date until Nov 20, 2001, the date of filing of this application.
5. The evidence submitted is insufficient to establish a conception of the invention prior to the effective date of the Menzie reference. While conception is the mental part of the inventive act, it must be capable of proof, such as by demonstrative evidence or by a complete disclosure to another. Conception is more than a vague idea of how to solve a problem. The requisite

Art Unit: 2151

means themselves and their interaction must also be comprehended. See *Mergenthaler v. Scudder*, 1897 C.D. 724, 81 O.G. 1417 (D.C. Cir. 1897). The exhibit does not demonstrate the evidence or proof in showing that the claimed conception took place.

6. Applicant merely showing the evidence of marketing and pricing communications dated from 1998 to July 2000, however, the applicant is still lack of the proof of conception with diligence from May, 2000 to Nov, 2000.

I. >< GENERAL REQUIREMENTS

The essential thing to be shown under 37 CFR 1.131 is priority of invention and this may be done by any satisfactory evidence of the fact. FACTS, not conclusions, must be alleged. Evidence in the form of exhibits may accompany the affidavit or declaration. Each exhibit relied upon should be specifically referred to in the affidavit or declaration, in terms of what it is relied upon to show. For example, the allegations of fact might be supported by submitting as evidence one or more of the following:

- (A) attached sketches;
- (B) attached blueprints;
- (C) attached photographs;
- (D) attached reproductions of notebook entries;
- (E) an accompanying model;
- (F) attached supporting statements by witnesses, where verbal disclosures are the evidence relied upon. *Ex parte Ovshinsky*, 10 USPQ2d 1075 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1989);
- (G) testimony given in an interference. Where interference testimony is used, the applicant must point out which parts of the testimony are being relied on; examiners cannot be expected to search the entire interference record for the evidence. *Ex parte Homan*, 1905 C.D. 288 (Comm'r Pat. 1905);
- (H) Disclosure documents (MPEP § 1706) may be used as documentary evidence of conception.

Exhibits and models must comply with the requirements of 37 CFR 1.91 to be entered into an application file. See also MPEP § 715.07(d).

Art Unit: 2151

A general allegation that the invention was completed prior to the date of the reference is not sufficient. *Ex parte Saunders*, 1883 C.D. 23, 23 O.G. 1224 (Comm'r Pat. 1883). Similarly, a declaration by the inventor to the effect that his or her invention was conceived or reduced to practice prior to the reference date, without a statement of facts demonstrating the correctness of this conclusion, is insufficient to satisfy 37 CFR 1.131. 37 CFR 1.131(b) requires that original exhibits of drawings or records, or photocopies thereof, accompany and form part of the affidavit or declaration or their absence satisfactorily explained. In *Ex parte Donovan*, 1890 C.D. 109, 52 O.G. 309 (Comm'r Pat. 1890) the court stated

If the applicant made sketches he should so state, and produce and describe them; if the sketches were made and lost, and their contents remembered, they should be reproduced and furnished in place of the originals. The same course should be pursued if the disclosure was by means of models. If neither sketches nor models

are relied upon, but it is claimed that verbal disclosures, sufficiently clear to indicate definite conception of the invention, were made the witness should state as nearly as possible the language used in imparting knowledge of the invention to others.

However, when reviewing a 37 CFR 1.131 affidavit or declaration, the examiner must consider all of the evidence presented in its entirety, including the affidavits or declarations and all accompanying exhibits, records and "notes." An accompanying exhibit need not support all claimed limitations, provided that any missing limitation is supported by the declaration itself. *Ex parte Ovshinsky*, 10 USPQ2d 1075 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1989).

The affidavit or declaration and exhibits must clearly explain which facts or data applicant is relying on to show completion of his or her invention prior to the particular date. Vague and general statements in broad terms about what the exhibits describe along with a general assertion that the exhibits describe a reduction to practice "amounts essentially to mere pleading, unsupported by proof or a showing of facts" and, thus, does not satisfy the requirements of 37 CFR 1.131(b). *In re Borkowski*, 505 F.2d 713, 184 USPQ 29 (CCPA 1974). Applicant must give a clear explanation of the exhibits pointing out exactly what facts are established and relied on by applicant. 505 F.2d at 718-19, 184 USPQ at 33. See also *In re Harry*, 333 F.2d 920, 142 USPQ 164 (CCPA 1964) (Affidavit "asserts that facts exist but does not tell what they are or when they occurred.").

Art Unit: 2151

7. The declaration filed on 03/15/06 fails to provide evidence to support the indicated claim of conception prior to the effective date of the Menzie reference. The evident is not enough to satisfy issues of conception as well as diligence.

8. The evidence submitted is insufficient to establish diligence from a date of conception to an actual reduction to practice. There is no information provided in the exhibits explicitly demonstrate diligence applied to reduce the method to practice.

Under 37 CFR 1.131, the critical period in which diligence must be shown begins just prior to the effective date of the reference or activity and ends with the date of a reduction to practice, either actual or constructive (i.e., filing a United States patent application). Note, therefore, that only diligence before reduction to practice is a material consideration. The "lapse of time between the completion or reduction to practice of an invention and the filing of an application thereon" is not relevant to an affidavit or declaration under 37 CFR 1.131. See *Ex parte Merz*, 75 USPQ 296 (Bd. App. 1947). Form paragraph 7.62 (reproduced in MPEP § 715) may be used to respond to a 37 CFR 1.131 affidavit where diligence is lacking.

The included Declaration fails to properly describe the events/dates between alleged conception (prior to May 15, 2000) and indicated Actual Reduction to Practice (November 21, 2001).

6. Regards with the 101 rejection, claims 1-9, 11-17 fail to set forth the operation of the claimed elements are tangible embodied on an article of manufacture. The applicant does not demonstrate a "clearly directed to practical applications that produce a useful concrete and tangible result", in the argument. Although the method does not need to be tangible, however, mathematical algorithm are not patentable distinguishable.

Referring back to claims 10, 18, and 25, signal embodied a carrier wave is still ineligible for patent protection because they do not fall within any of the four statutory classes. See New Guidelines.

7. Applicant argued that there is no software program limitation on patentable subject matter, however, on the disclosure of Affidavits filed on 3/15/06, page 78, quoted: "The company's Outcomes Monitoring System ("System") for ambulatory surgery centers is a software system that enters, uploads and stores patient information submitted ...etc". It is unclear that how the application is not an software program limitation?

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claim 1-9, and 11-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter (The claims fail to set forth the operation of the claimed elements are tangible embodied on an article of manufacture. See New Guidelines).

Mathematical algorithm is not patentable subject.

Claims 10, 18 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter (signal embodied a carrier wave is still ineligible for patent protection because they do not fall within any of the four statutory classes. See New Guidelines)

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

Art Unit: 2151

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Menzie et al hereinafter Menzie (US 6,650,932).

1. Referring to Claims 1, 11, 24, and 25, Menzie discloses collecting at least two outcomes data sets (refer to Col 1, Lines 30-50);

At least one processor readable carrier (refer to Col 5);

Instructions carried on the at least one carrier (it is inherent that software comprises instructions, refer to Col 5);

Wherein the instructions are configured to be readable from the at least one carrier by at least one processor and thereby cause the at least one processor to operate so as to (refer to Col 4, Lines Col 5 and Col 18, Lines 35-55):

Converting the at least two outcomes data sets into at least one outcomes result (test results, refer to Col 2, Lines 8-30).

Establishing a norm for an outcomes data group, the outcomes data group comprising a plurality of the at least two outcomes data sets (refer to Col 2, Lines 25-60 and Col 6, Lines 60-67 and Col 7, Lines 1-35).

Art Unit: 2151

Comparing a selected one of the at least one outcomes result to the norm (refer to Col 6, Lines 60-67, and Col 7, Lines 1-30);

Generating at least one outcomes monitoring report comprising the selected one of the at least one outcomes result and the norm (refer to Col 5 - 9).

2. Referring to Claim 19, Menzie discloses

A data collection portion wherein the data collection portion collects at least two outcomes data sets (refer to Col 4, Lines 15-67)

A data processor portion wherein the data processor portion receives the at least two outcomes data sets from the data collection portion and wherein the data processor (refer to Col 4 and 5) comprises:

A converter portion wherein the converter portion converts the at least two outcomes data sets into an at least one outcomes result (test results, refer to Col 2, Lines 8-30);

A norm establishing portion wherein the norm established portion establishes a norm for an outcomes data group, the outcomes data group comprising a plurality of the at least two outcomes data sets (refer to Col 2, Lines 25-60 and Col 6, Lines 60-67 and Col 7, Lines 1-35).

A comparison portion wherein the comparison portion compares a selected one of the at least one outcomes result to the norm (refer to Col 6, Lines 60-67, and Col 7, Lines 1-30);
and a report generation portion wherein the report generation portion generates at least one outcomes monitoring report comprising the at least one outcomes result and the norm (refer to Col 5 - 9);

Art Unit: 2151

3. Referring to Claims 2 and 12, Menzie discloses transmitting the at least two outcomes data sets to a data processor (refer to Col 2, Lines 8-31, Col 4, Lines 50-67).
4. Referring to Claims 3, 13, and 21, Menzie discloses selectively restricting access to the outcomes monitoring report (refer to Col 11, Lines 5-30).
5. Referring to Claims 4, and 14 and 20, Menzie posting the outcomes monitoring report over the webpage (refer to Col 4 and 6).
6. Referring to Claims 5 and 16, Menzie discloses collecting the at least two outcomes data sets from at least one user entity at a plurality of discrete intervals (refer to Col 1, Col 2, Col 11, Lines 1-60, and Col 13, 14, and 16).
7. Referring to Claim 7, Menzie discloses generating the outcomes report from at least two of the plurality of discrete intervals (refer to Col 5 – 9, Col 1, 2, 11, Lines 1 – 60 , and Col 13, 14, and 16).
8. Referring to Claims 8 and 16, Menzie discloses collecting the outcomes data sets from a plurality of user entities (refer to Col 11, and Col 17),
individually identifying and converting the outcomes data sets for each user entity of the plurality of user entities (refer to Col 11, Col 13, and 14),

Art Unit: 2151

and wherein the outcomes data sets from the plurality of user entities comprises the outcomes data group (refer to Col 11).

9. Referring to Claim 9 and 17, Menzie discloses wherein the outcomes monitoring report includes at least one outcomes result for a selected user entity of the plurality of user entities and at least one comparison of the norm to the selected one of the least one outcomes result for the selected user entity (refer to Col 5, 6, 7, 10, 14, 16, and 17).

10. Referring to Claim 10 and 11, Menzie discloses a computer signal embodies in a carrier wave readable by a computing system and encoding a computer program of instructions for executing a computer process performing the method recited in claim 1 (refer to Col 5, 12, 13, 15, and 18).

11. Referring to Claim 22, Menzie discloses wherein the at least two outcomes data sets are surgical procedures outcomes data set (refer to Col 1 and 2).

12. Referring to Claim 23, Menzie discloses wherein the at least two surgical procedures outcomes dataset are primary source data sets (refer to Col 1 and 2).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-3, 5-13, 15-19, and 21-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Kraft et al hereinafter Kraft (US 5,299,119).

13. Referring to Claims 1, 11, 19, 24, and 25, Kraft discloses collecting at least two outcomes data sets (refer to Col 13, Lines 45-67);

At least one processor readable carrier (refer to microprocessor, Col 12, Lines 30-35);

Instructions carried on the at least one carrier (software comprises instructions, refer to Col 5);

Wherein the instructions are configured to be readable from the at least one carrier by at least one processor and thereby cause the at least one processor to operate so as to (refer to Col 14, Lines 5-20):

Converting the at least two outcomes data sets into at least one outcomes result (test results, refer to Col 13, Lines 45-67, Col 14, Lines 60-67 and Col 15, Lines 15-55).

Establishing a norm for an outcomes data group, the outcomes data group comprising a plurality of the at least two outcomes data sets (refer to Col 20, Lines 30-55, and Col 13, Lines 45-67).

Comparing a selected one of the at least one outcomes result to the norm (refer to Col 17, Lines 50-67 and Col 18, Lines 1-15, 30-67);

Generating at least one outcomes monitoring report comprising the selected one of the at least one outcomes result and the norm (refer to Col 13, Lines 45-67).

14. Referring to Claims 2 and 12, Kraft discloses transmitting the at least two outcomes data sets to a data processor (refer to Col 14, Lines 5-67).

15. Referring to Claims 3, 13, and 21, Kraft discloses selectively restricting access to the outcomes monitoring report (Operator is the one has access to report, refer to Col 15, Lines 20-67).
16. Referring to Claims 5 and 16, Kraft discloses collecting the at least two outcomes data sets from at least one user entity at a plurality of discrete intervals (refer to Col 14, Lines 5-60).
17. Referring to Claim 7, Kraft discloses generating the outcomes report from at least two of the plurality of discrete intervals (refer to Col 14, Lines 5-60, Col 15, Lines 15-55).
18. Referring to Claims 8 and 16, Kraft discloses collecting the outcomes data sets from a plurality of user entities (refer to Col 14, Lines 5-60),
individually identifying and converting the outcomes' data sets for each user entity of the plurality of user entities (refer to Col 14, Lines 60-67 and Col 15, Lines 1-55),
and wherein the outcomes data sets from the plurality of user entities comprises the outcomes data group (refer to Col 15, Lines 15-55).
19. Referring to Claim 9 and 17, Kraft discloses wherein the outcomes monitoring report includes at least one outcomes result for a selected user entity of the plurality of user entities and at least one comparison of the norm to the selected one of the least one outcomes result

Art Unit: 2151

for the selected user entity (refer to Col 13, Lines 45-67, Col 14, Lines 60-67, Col 15, Lines 1-15).

20. Referring to Claim 10 and 11, Kraft discloses a computer signal embodies in a carrier wave readable by a computing system and encoding a computer program of instructions for executing a computer process performing the method recited in claim 1 (refer to Col 15, Lines 1-15, Col 15, Lines 55-67, Col 16, Lines 1-30).

21. Referring to Claim 22, Kraft discloses wherein the at least two outcomes data sets are surgical procedures outcomes data set (refer to Col 14, Lines 5-60).

22. Referring to Claim 23, Kraft discloses wherein the at least two surgical procedures outcomes dataset are primary source data sets (refer to Col 14, Lines 5-60).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 4, 14, 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kraft et al hereinafter Kraft (US 5,299,119) in view of Killcommons et al hereinafter Killcommons (US 6,424,996).

23. Referring to Claims 4, and 14 and 20, Kraft posting the outcomes monitoring report (refer to Col 15, Lines 20-66) Kraft did not expressly disclose posting the report on the webpage over the webpage (refer to Col 4 and 6).

Killcommons disclosed posting the report on the webpage over the webpage (refer to Col 13, Lines 4-50).

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious of ordinary skill in the art to combine both Kraft and Killcommons' invention since both arts are analogues.

The suggestion/motivation would have been that by receiving data/information and post the information on the web page, it provides the faster access for people that wants to work remote location in the medical field.

Conclusion

A shortened statutory period for reply to this Office action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Karen C. Tang whose telephone number is (571)272-3116. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7 - 3.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Zarni Maung can be reached on (571)272-3939. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2151

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Karen Tang

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Zarni Maung', with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

ZARNI MAUNG
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER